REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 22, 2008 from the United States Patent and Trademark Office, claims 1-6, 8-10 and 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,982,804 to Frolik et al. (hereinafter "Frolik"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,603,565 to Scheidig et al. (hereinafter "Scheidig"), U.S. Patent No. 6,111,654 to Cartier et al. (hereinafter "Cartier") and well known prior art, claims 11-13 were apparently rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frolik in view of Scheidig, U.S. Patent No. 6,026,436 to Hawes (hereinafter "Hawes") and well known prior art, and claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frolik, Scheidig, Cartier, and well known prior art and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,707 to Taniguchi et al. (hereinafter "Taniguchi").

Applicant has amended the claim set to more distinctly define over the cited references and respectfully provides the following:

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

In the Office Action, claims 1-6, 8-10, and 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frolik, Scheidig, Cartier, and well known prior art, claims 11-13 were apparently rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frolik, Scheidig, Hawes, and well known prior art, and claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frolik, Sheidig, Cartier, well known prior art, and Taniguchi. Applicant notes that Hawes was recited in the explanation of the rejections of claims 11-13 but was not cited in the introduction of the rejections.

M.P.E.P. § 2141 sets forth the *Graham* factual enquiries that should be considered when making an obviousness rejection under Section 103: 1) ascertaining the scope and content of the prior art; 2) ascertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; and 3) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. (Citing *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966).) In addition, M.P.E.P. §§ 2141 and 2142 set forth that "the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit." (Citing *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. (KSR)*, 550 U.S. ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).)

For a rejection under Section 103 to stand, it must explicitly set forth 1) factual findings showing that each claim element was known in the art at the time of the invention, and 2) factual findings showing that one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, would have found it obvious to modify or combine the teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. (See, for example, the enumerated required articulations set forth in M.P.E.P. § 2143 for each lettered rationale.) Applicant respectfully submits that the references in the Office Action, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the limitations claimed in the claim set provided herein.

Independent claim 1, as amended, requires: "In a printing environment, a method for specifying application specific printing requirements for an arbitrary printing device, the method comprising: providing a printing device having a plurality of default device setting sets stored in memory of the printing device; configuring one of the default device setting sets by selectively associating an application specific name with one of: (i) a standard default setting set; and (ii) an application specific default setting; identifying which of the default device setting sets are to be used in rendering a particular print job; and rendering the print job without further preparation of

the print data regardless of the default print setting set selected." Such limitations are not taught by the combination of Frolik, Scheidig, Cartier and the well known prior art.

Frolik teaches a computer system application that selects printer settings from a variety of sources. (Abstract) In Frolik, the printer settings may be stored in control files on a document server that delivers documents on request to a client (Col 3 line 64-Col 4 line 4), and they may be stored in data files in memory on a client computer (Col 4 lines 24-25, Col 4 line 59-Col 5 line6) (See also Fig 1.). When printing occurs, the printer settings are selected from the data files in the client computer's memory and then inserted into the print job. (Fig 3 and Col 7 lines 12-34) The problem with this method is that the application must insert the settings in a format that is compatible with the print job. For example, if the the printer is capable of receiving both a PS and a PCL job, the application must support both a PS and a PCL format for inserting the settings. Frolik does not disclose a printing device having a plurality of default device setting sets stored in memory of the printing device and, rendering the print job without further preparation of the print data regardless of the default print setting set selected as is required by claim 1. Indeed, as set forth above, Frolik specifically discloses additional processing to insert the print job settings into the print job. For at least these reasons, Frolik does not teach all elements of independent claim 1.

Scheidig also fails to teach the recited claim limitations. Scheidig teaches printers capable of operating using a plurality of printer languages. (Col 1 lines 9-10) In Scheidig, various setup data sets are stored in a control panel unit of a high-performance printer, and upon reception of print data, the printer detects the printer language of the print data and loads the data set corresponding to the detected printer language. (Col 2 lines 56-64; Col 5 lines 53-60) Thus, the setup data sets of Scheidig are not printer setting sets of the type disclosed in Frolik and

therefore, it has not been shown that one of skill in the art would find it obvious to modify the system of Frolik that uses a computer to select printer settings from the computer and to include them in the print job sent to the printer with the printer-based setting sets of Scheidig. The proposed motivation of storing data locally to increase retrieval speed would not be achieved by adding the features of Scheidig to Frolik, as Frolik already discloses that setting sets are stored locally. (See Fig. 1: Data Files 181 containing the settings are stored on the local Client 106, and (Fig. 3) are retrieved therefrom and used by the application to modify the printer input.) Additionally, Scheidig does not teach rendering the print job without further preparation of the print data regardless of the default print setting set selected as is required by claim 1. Therefore, Scheidig also fails to teach the elements of claim 1 not taught by Frolik.

The well known prior art and Cartier also fail to teach the relevant claim limitations. As none of the cited references teach the recited claim limitations, the cited references, when combined, also fail to teach the recited limitations. Therefore, one of skill in the art would not have found the claimed invention of claim 1 obvious over the cited references, given the differences between the limited disclosure of the cited references and the claimed invention.

Independent claim 14 contains similar limitations to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and is therefore similarly allowable. Claims 2-10 and 15-20 depend from one of claims 1 and 14, respectively, and are therefore similarly allowable.

Independent claim 11 also includes similar limitations to those discussed above. Hawes also fails to teach such limitations. Therefore, one of skill in the art would not have found the claimed invention of claim 11 obvious over the cited references, given the differences between the limited disclosure of the cited references and the claimed invention. Claims 12-13 depend from claim 11 and are therefore also allowable.

Further, regarding dependent claim 4 and independent claim 11, claim 4 has been amended to further define over the cited art. Specifically, claim 4 as amended recites: "A method as recited in claim 3, wherein the characteristic is one of: (i) a job name; (ii) a user name; (iii) an account code; and (iv) a department code." Frolik does not teach such limitations. Applicant notes that the portion of Frolik cited against claim 4 only teaches a print job that has no document specific settings and that the system of Frolik in such cases checks for application specific settings corresponding to the "application 179." (Col. 9 lines 22-30) If no such settings are found, the global printer settings are used. (Col. 9 lines 30-34.) Thus, Frolik fails to teach selection of a default device setting set to be used based on a characteristic of the print job, the characteristic being one of a job name, a user name, an account code, or a department code. For this additional reason, Claim 4 is not made obvious by the cited references. Claim 11 includes similar limitations and is also therefore not made obvious by the cited references for at least this additional reason.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests removal of all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the amendments made herein do not add new matter and that the claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests favorable reconsideration. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this communication, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

DATED this 7 day of January, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael F. Krieger
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 35,232

KIRTON & McCONKIE
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 321-4814
Facsimile: (801) 321-4893

ADS
1109015